

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application, based on the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1 and 5, as amended, and new claims 8-25, will be pending.

The amendments to claims 1 and 5 are supported throughout the specification and the original claims. The newly added claims are supported throughout the specification, especially pages 3, 4 and 5, and the Examples.

Accordingly, no new matter is added.

The amendments to claims 1 and 5 avoid the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Schmitz et al (§102(e)) and over Bayer (or its English language equivalent to Joachimi et al, U.S. 6,566,486 (§102(b))).

The rejection of claims 2-7 and 6-7, (if considered applicable as applied to the amended claims 1 and 5), under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Bayer in view of Johnston, is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Bayer is concerned with a particular type of branched polyamide. The branched polyamide may be processed by any one of several alternative methods. There is no disclosure of blow-molding a multilayer film of a branched polyamide and at least one polyolefin layer wherein the polyolefin layer consists essentially of LLDPE or polypropylene.

As described in the specification, attempts to blow-mold LLDPE and polypropylene, in the absence of amounts of LDPE or other polyolefins, known to provide bubble stability during blow molding, but which tend to degrade the functional benefits of LLDPE or polypropylene, have not been successful. The Comparative Examples A and B in the specification of this application clearly demonstrate and support this conclusion.

Johnston does not obviate the deficiencies of Bayer.

Johnston is concerned with laminated multilayer films which are heat-sealed for making packages suitable for storing sterilizable products, e.g., medicines. There is no disclosure or suggestion for blow-molding multilayer films. There is no disclosure of using branched polyamides to allow use of otherwise unstable bubble-forming polyolefins, such as LLDPE and polypropylene, to form blow-molded products.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combined disclosures (assuming the propriety of combining these two disparate references in the first instance, which is not conceded) would not have led the practitioner to a process for blow-molding a multilayer film containing a branched polyamide and a polyolefin consisting essentially of LLDPE (containing at most 5% of another polyolefin), or consisting essentially of polypropylene. Similarly, the prior art to Bayer and Johnston do not disclose or suggest a multilayer film wherein a polyolefin, which consists essentially of polypropylene or LLDPE (with at most 5% of another polyolefin) is bonded or adhered directly to a branched polyamide.

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: Richard A. Steinberg
Richard A. Steinberg
Registration No. 26,588
Direct No. (202) 263-3325

Paul L. Sharer
Registration No. 36,004
Direct No. (202) 263-3340

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: February 21, 2006